

Page 6

Remarks

This is filed further to the Response to Office Action mailed April 28, 2004 and to the Telephone Interview conducted this same day herewith. The claims are amended, as discussed during the Interview, in order to clarify still further patentable distinctions over the art of record. In view thereof, the Applicants request that this application be passed forward to issuance.

Interview Summary

Present during the aforementioned Telephone Interview were Examiner Patel, Allen Hertz (a representative of the Assignee), and the undersigned. The (telephonically) assembled parties discussed the Section 112 and Section 102/103 rejections lodged in the first Office Action. The Applicants also discussed distinctions between the claimed invention and the cited art. Following review of the role of the so-called feature objects, the Applicants stated they would supply an amendment reciting those objects in the independent claims.


The Amendments

The amendments provided above do just that — they recite the role of the feature objects in the independent claims. In addition to the patentable distinctions discussed in Applicants' prior Response, recitation of those feature objects provide further distinction over the cited art, e.g., for the reasons during the interview. The amendments are made without prejudice, the Applicants reserving the right to re-present cancelled subject matter at a later date.

In view hereof, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections, so that this application may be passed forward to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

NUTTER, MCLENNEN & FISH, LLP


David J. Powsner
Reg. No. 31,868

Attorney for Applicant
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210-2604
Tel: (617)439-2717
Fax: (617)310-9717